

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 7, 8, and 15. Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner objected to the Abstract; objected to claim 15 for informalities; rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; and rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner objected to the Abstract for various reasons including, for example, the Examiner is not sure what is meant by “[a] remote controlling device that is not dependent on the control target device” and whether the term “remote controlling device” should be “remote control device.” See Office Action, p. 3. In response, Applicant submits a new Abstract which addresses the Examiner’s concerns. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the Abstract.

Objection to Claim 15

The Examiner objected to claim 15 for a minor informality. In response, Applicant has amended claim 15 to correct a minor typographical error. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claim 15.

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Rejection of Claims 1-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, because the “examiner is not sure how and/or why control commands are respectively corresponded to the plurality of operation instructions.” Office Action, pp. 5-6. Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant directs the Examiner to Applicant’s Figs. 5A and 5B and to Specification, page 13, line 21 to page 14, line 9. These portions of Applicant’s disclosure describe the control commands corresponding to operation instructions. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, and 8 to more clearly define the scope of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. However, to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 7 to recite “[a] computer program product stored in a computer readable medium.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 18, 2007

By: *Danell A. Kunda, Jr. # 57,460*
for Richard V. Burgujian
Reg. No. 31,744